



£ J V

The
Patent
Office

889 n


PCT/GB 00 / 00 1 7 1



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

GD00 / 171

The Patent Office
Concept House
Cardiff Road
Newport
South Wales
NP10 8QQ




I, the undersigned, being an officer duly authorised in accordance with Section 74(1) and (4) of the Deregulation & Contracting Out Act 1994, to sign and issue certificates on behalf of the Comptroller-General, hereby certify that annexed hereto is a true copy of the documents as originally filed in connection with the patent application identified therein.

In accordance with the Patents (Companies Re-registration) Rules 1982, if a company named in this certificate and any accompanying documents has re-registered under the Companies Act 1980 with the same name as that with which it was registered immediately before re-registration save for the substitution as, or inclusion as, the last part of the name of the words "public limited company" or their equivalents in Welsh, references to the name of the company in this certificate and any accompanying documents shall be treated as references to the name with which it is so re-registered.

In accordance with the rules, the words "public limited company" may be replaced by p.l.c., plc, P.L.C. or PLC.

Re-registration under the Companies Act does not constitute a new legal entity but merely subjects the company to certain additional company law rules.



Signed

[Signature]


Dated

28-1-00

**PRIORITY
DOCUMENT**

SUBMITTED OR TRANSMITTED IN
COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 17.1(a) OR (b)

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)

Patents Act 1977
(Rule 16)15 FEB 99 E425258-1 D03052
P01/7700 0.00 - 9903293.0**Request for grant of a patent**

(See the notes on the back of this form. You can also get an explanatory leaflet from the Patent Office to help you fill in this form)

9903293.0The Patent Office
Cardiff Road
Newport
Gwent NP9 1RH

1. Your reference

A25757

2. Patent application number

(The Patent Office will fill in this part)

3. Full name, address and postcode of the or of
Each applicant (*underline all surnames*)**BRITISH TELECOMMUNICATIONS public limited company
81 NEWGATE STREET
LONDON, EC1A 7AJ, England
Registered in England: 1800000**Patents ADP number (*if you know it*)**1867002**If the applicant is a corporate body, give the
country/state of its incorporation**UNITED KINGDOM**

4. Title of the invention

ANALYSIS OF VIDEO SIGNAL QUALITY5. Name of your agent (*if you have one*)**LIDBETTER, Timothy Guy Edwin**"Address for Service" in the United Kingdom
to which all correspondence should be sent
(*including the postcode*)**BT GROUP LEGAL SERVICES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
HOLBORN CENTRE
120 HOLBORN
LONDON, EC1N 2TE**Patents ADP number (*if you know it*)**1867001 X****6990493001**6. If you are declaring priority from one or more
earlier patent applications, give the country
and the date of filing of the or of each of these
earlier applications and (*if you know it*) the or
each application number

Country

Priority application number
(*if you know it*)Date of filing
(*day / month / year*)7. If this application is divided or otherwise
derived from an earlier UK application,
give the number and the filing date of
the earlier application

Number of earlier application

Date of filing
(*day/month/year*)8. Is a statement of inventorship and of right
to grant of a patent required in support of
this request? (*Answer 'Yes' if:***YES**

- a) any applicant named in part 3 is not an inventor, or
- b) there is an inventor who is not named as an applicant, or
- c) any named applicant is a corporate body.

(See note (d))

Patents Form 1/77

9. Enter the number of sheets for any of the following items you are filing with this form.
Do not count copies of the same document

Continuation sheets of this form

Description **14**
Claim(s) **4**
Abstract **1**
Drawing(s) **3 + 3**



10. If you are also filing any of the following, state how many against each item

Priority Documents

Translations of priority documents

Statement of inventorship and right to grant of a patent (*Patents Form 7/77*)

Request for preliminary examination and search (*Patents Form 9/77*)

Request for substantive examination (*Patents Form 10/77*)

Any other documents
(please specify)

11. I/We request the grant of a patent on the basis of this application.
Signature(s) Date:

12 February 1999

Timothy Guy Edwin LIDBETTER, Authorised Signatory

12. Name and daytime telephone number of person to contact in the United Kingdom **Bhavna Vasani 0171 492 8147**

Warning

After an application for a patent has been filed, the Comptroller of the Patent Office will consider whether publication or communication of the invention should be prohibited or restricted under Section 22 of the Patents Act 1977. You will be informed if it is necessary to prohibit or restrict your invention in this way. Furthermore, if you live in the United Kingdom, Section 23 of the Patents Act 1977 stops you from applying for a patent abroad without first getting written permission from the Patent Office unless an application has been filed at least 6 weeks beforehand in the United Kingdom for a patent for the same invention and either no direction prohibiting publication or communication has been given, or any such direction has been revoked.

Notes

- a) If you need help to fill in this form or you have any questions, please contact the Patent Office on 0645 500505.
- b) Write your answers in capital letters using black ink or you may type them.
- c) If there is not enough space for all the relevant details on any part of this form, please continue on a separate sheet of paper and write "see continuation sheet" in the relevant part(s). Any continuation sheet should be attached to this form.
- d) If you have answered 'Yes' Patents Form 7/77 will need to be filed.
- e) Once you have filled in the form you must remember to sign and date it.
- f) For details of the fee and ways to pay please contact the Patent Office.

ANALYSIS OF VIDEO SIGNAL QUALITY

This invention relates to the analysis of the quality of video signals. It has a number of applications in monitoring the performance of video transmission
5 equipment, either during development, under construction, or in service.

As communications systems have increased in complexity it has become increasingly difficult to measure their performance objectively. Modern communications links frequently use data compression techniques to reduce the bandwidth required for transmission. When signals are compressed for more efficient
10 transmission, conventional engineering metrics, such as signal-to-noise ratio or bit error rate, are unreliable indicators of the performance experienced by the human being who ultimately receives the signal. For example, two systems having similar bit-error rates may have markedly different effects on the quality of the data (sound or picture) presented to the end user, depending on which digital bits are lost. Other
15 non-linear processes such as echo cancellation are also becoming increasingly common. The complexity of modern communications systems makes them unsuitable for analysis using conventional signal processing techniques. End-to-end assessment of network quality must be based on what the customer has, or would have, heard or seen.

20 The main benchmarks of viewer opinion are the subjective tests carried out to International Telecommunications Union standards P.800, *"Methods for subjective determination of transmission quality"*, 1996 and P.911 *"Subjective audiovisual quality assessment methods for multimedia applications"*, 1998. These measure perceived quality in controlled subjective experiments, in which several human
25 subjects listen to each signal under test. This is impractical for use in the continuous monitoring of a network, and also compromises the privacy of the parties to the calls being monitored. To overcome these problems, auditory perceptual models such as those of the present applicant's International Patent Specifications WO 94/00922, WO95/01011, WO95/15035, WO97/05730, WO97/32428, WO98/53589 and
30 WO98/53590 are being developed for measuring telephone network quality. These are objective performance metrics, but are designed to relate directly to perceived signal quality, by producing quality scorings similar to those which would have been reported by human subjects.

The prior art systems referred to above measure the quality of sound (audio) signals. The present invention is concerned with the application of similar principles to video signals. The basic principle, of emulating the human perceptual system (in this case the eye/brain system instead of the ear/brain system) is still used, but video signals and the human visual perceptual system are both much more complex, and raise new problems.

As with hearing, the human visual perception system has physiological properties that make some of the features present in visual stimuli very difficult or impossible to perceive. Compression processes, such as those established by JPEG (Joint Pictures Expert Group) and MPEG (Motion Pictures Expert Group) rely on these properties to reduce the amount of information to transmit in video signals. The quality of the resulting still or moving images cannot therefore be evaluated by simple comparison of the original and final signals. The properties of human vision have to be included in the assessment of perceived quality.

It is problematic to try and locate information from an image by mathematical processing of pixel values. The pixel intensity level becomes meaningful only when processed by our visual knowledge of objects and shapes. In this invention, mathematical solutions are used to extract information resembling that used by the brain as closely as possible.

A number of different approaches to visual modelling have been reported. These are specialised to particular applications, or to particular types of video distortion. For example, the MPEG compression system seeks to code the differences between successive frames. At periods of overload, when there are many differences between successive frames, this process reduces the pixel resolution, causing blocks of uniform colour and luminance to be produced. Karunasekera, A. S., and Kingsbury, N. G., in *"A distortion measure for blocking artefacts in images based on human visual sensitivity"*, *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 4, No. 6, pages 713-724, June 1995, propose a model which is especially designed to detect "blockiness" of this kind. However, such blockiness does not always signify an error, as the effect may have been introduced deliberately by the producer of the image, either for visual effect or to conceal detail, such as the facial features of a person whose identity is be concealed.

If the requirements of a wide range of applications, from high definition television to video conferencing and virtual reality, are to be met, a more complex architecture has to be used.

Some existing visual models have an elementary emulation of perceptual characteristics, referred to herein as a "perceptual layer". Examples are found in the Karunasekera reference already discussed, and Lukas, X. J., and Budrikis, Z. L., *"Picture Quality Prediction Based on a Visual Model"*, *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. com-30, No. 7, pp. 1679-1692 July 1982, in which the assumption that large errors will dominate subjectivity forms the basis of a simple perceptual layer. Other approaches are also used, such as a model of the temporal aggregation of errors described by Tan, K. T., Ghanbari, M. and Pearson, D. E., *"A video distortion meter"*, *Informationstechnische Gesellschaft, Picture Coding Symposium, Berlin, September 1997*. However, none of these approaches addresses the relative importance of all errors present in the image.

For the purposes of the present specification, the "colour" of a pixel is defined as the proportions of the primary colours (red, green and blue) in the pixel. The "luminance" is the total intensity of the three primary colours. In particular, different shades on a grey scale are caused by variations in luminance.

According to a first aspect of the present invention, there is provided a method of measuring the differences between a first video signal and a second video signal, comprising the steps of:

analysing the information content of each video signal to identify the perceptually relevant boundaries of the video images depicted therein; and

comparing the boundaries so defined in the first signal with those in the second signal; the comparison including determination of the extent to which the properties of the boundaries defined in the original image are preserved,

generating an output indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals.

According to a second aspect of the present invention, there is provided an apparatus for measuring the differences between a first video signal and a second video signal, comprising:

analysis means for the information content of each video signal to identify the perceptually relevant boundaries of the video images depicted therein; and

comparison means for comparing the boundaries so defined in the first signal with those in the second signal; the comparison including determination of the extent to which the properties of the boundaries defined in the original image are preserved, and for generating an output indicative of the perceptual difference between
5 the first and second signals.

The boundaries between the main elements of an image may be identified by any measurable property used by the human perceptual system to distinguish between such elements. These may include, but are not limited to, colour, luminance, so-called "hard" edges (a narrow line of contrasting colour defining an outline or other
10 boundary, identified in image analysis) as a region of high spatial frequency, and others which will be discussed later.

The properties of the boundaries on which the comparison is based include the characteristics by which such boundaries are defined. In particular, if a boundary defined by a given characteristic is affected by loss of that characteristic, the degree
15 of perceived degradation of the image element is dependant on how perceptually important the original boundary was, whether the element defined by the boundary can nevertheless be identified in the degraded image by means of a boundary defined by another characteristic, how perceptually significant such a boundary is, and how closely its position corresponds with the original, lost, boundary.

20 The basis for the invention is that elements present in the image are not of equal importance. An error will be more perceptible if it disrupts the shape of one of the essential features of the image. For example, a distortion present on an edge in the middle of a textured region will be less perceptible than the same error on an independent edge. This is because an edge forming part of a texture carries less
25 information than an independent edge, as described by Ran, X., and Favardin, N., "A Perceptually Motivated Three-Component Image Model - Part II: Application to Image Compression", *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 713-724, April 1995. If, however, a textured area defines a boundary, an error that changes the properties of the texture throughout the textured area can be as important as an
30 error on an independent edge, if the error causes the textured characteristics of the area to be lost. The present invention examines the perceptual relevance of each boundary, and the extent to which this relevance is preserved.

The process identifies the elements of greatest perceptual relevance, that is the boundaries between the principal elements of the image. Small variations in a property within the regions defined by the boundaries are of less relevance than errors that cause the boundary to change its shape.

5 Moreover, the process allows comparison of this information independently of how the principal elements of the images are identified. The human perceptual system can distinguish different regions of an image in many different ways. For example, the absence of a "hard edge" will create a greater perceptual degradation if the regions separated by that edge are of similar colour than it will if they are of
10 contrasting colours, since the colour contrast will still allow a boundary to be perceived. The more abrupt the change, the greater the perceptual significance of the boundary.

By analysing the boundaries defined in the image, a number of further developments become possible.

15 The boundaries can be used as a frame of reference, by identifying the principal elements in each image and the differences in their relative positions. By using differences in relative position, as opposed to absolute position, perceptually unimportant differences in the images can be disregarded, as they do not affect the quality of the resulting image as perceived by the viewer. In particular, if one image is
20 offset relative to another, there are many differences between individual pixels of one image and the corresponding pixels of the other, but these differences are not perceptually relevant provided that the boundaries are in the same relative positions. By referring to the principal boundaries of the image, rather than an absolute (pixel co-ordinate) frame of reference, any such offset can be compensated for.

25 The analysis may also include identification of perceptually significant image features, again identified by the shapes of the boundaries identified rather than how these boundaries are defined. The output indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals can be weighted according to the perceptual significance of such image features. Significant features would include those features
30 which distinguish one character of text from another, or the various characteristics which make up a human face, and in particular those which are significant in providing visual speech cues, as such features are of particular significance to the human cognitive system and so errors such as distortion, absence, presence of

spurious elements or changes in relative position are of greater perceptual relevance in those features than in others.

An embodiment of the invention will now be described, by way of example only, with reference to the Figures, in which:

- 5 Figure 1 illustrates schematically the sensory emulation layer of the system
- Figure 2 illustrates the filter parameters used in the sensory layer
- Figure 3 illustrates schematically the perceptual layer of the system
- Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7 illustrate four ways in which boundaries may be perceived.

- 10 In this embodiment the measurement process comprises two stages, illustrated in Figures 1 and 3 respectively. The first – the sensory layer – accounts for the physical sensitivity of the human visual system to given stimuli. The second – the perceptual layer – estimates the subjective intrusion caused by the remaining visible errors. The various functional elements shown in Figures 1 and 3 may be
- 15 embodied as software running on a general-purpose computer.

The sensory layer (Figure 1) reproduces the gross psychophysics of the sensory mechanisms:

- (i) spatio-temporal sensitivity known as the human visual filter, and
- (ii) masking due to spatial frequency, orientation and temporal frequency.

- 20 Figure 1 gives a representation of the sensory layer, which emulates the physical properties of the human visual system. The same processes are applied to both the original signal and the degraded signal: these may be carried out simultaneously in parallel processing units, or they may be performed for each signal in turn, using the same processing units.

- 25 The sensory layer identifies details that are not physically perceptible, and those to which the visual system is more sensitive. To do so, it emulates the two main characteristics of the visual system that have an influence on the physical perceptibility of a visual stimulus:

- sensitivity of the eye/brain system
- 30 • masking effects – that is the variation in perceptual importance of one stimulus according to the presence of other stimuli.

Each of these characteristics has both a time and a space dimension, as will now be discussed.

Each signal is first filtered in temporal and spatial frequency by a filter 12, to produce a filtered sequence. The values used in the filter 12 are selected to emulate the human visual response, as already discussed in relation to Figure 2. This filter allows details that are not visible to a human visual (eye/brain) system to be removed, and therefore not counted as errors, while the perceptibility of details at other spatial and temporal frequencies is increased by the greater sensitivity of the human sensory system at those frequencies. This has the effect of weighting the information that the signals contain according to visual acuity.

The human visual system is more sensitive to some spatial and temporal frequencies than others. Everyday experience teaches us that we cannot see details smaller than a certain size. Spatial resolution is referred to in terms of spatial frequency, which is defined by counting the number of cycles of a sinusoidal pattern present per degree subtended at the eye. Closely spaced lines (fine details) correspond to high spatial frequencies, while large patterns correspond to low spatial frequencies. Once this concept is introduced, human vision can be compared to a filter, with peak (mid-range) sensitivity to spatial frequencies of around 8 cycles/degree and insensitivity to high frequencies (more than 60 cycles/degree). A similar filter characteristic can be applied in the temporal domain, where the eye fails to perceive flickering faster than about 50 Hz. The overall filter characteristic for both spatial and temporal frequency can be represented as a surface, as shown in Figure 2, in which the axes are spatial and temporal frequency (measured in cycles/degree and Hertz respectively). The vertical axis is sensitivity, with units normalised such that maximum sensitivity is equal to 1.

The second aspect of vision to be modelled by the sensory layer is known as "masking", the reduced perceptibility of errors in areas of an image where there is greater spatial activity present, and the temporal counterpart of this effect decreases the visibility of details as the rate of movement increases. Masking can be understood by considering the organisation of the primary cortex, the first stage of the brain responsible for visual processing. Each part of the cortex is sensitive to a certain region of the retina. The incoming image stream is divided into groupings (known as channels) of spatial frequency, temporal frequency and orientation. The "next stage" of the brain processes the image stream as a set of channels, each accounting for a combination of spatial/temporal frequency and orientation in the corresponding area

of the retina. Once a given channel is excited, it tends to inhibit its neighbours, making it more difficult to detect other details that are close in proximity, spatial or temporal frequency, or orientation.

Masking is a measure of the amount of inhibition a channel causes to its
5 neighbours. This information is obtained by studying the masking produced by
representative samples of channels, in terms of spatial/temporal frequency and
orientation characteristics. For the sensory layer to simulate activity masking, it is
necessary to know the amount of activity present in each combination of spatial
frequency and orientation within an image. This calculation can be performed using a
10 Gabor function, a flexible form of bandpass filter, to generate respective outputs 14
in which the content of each signal is split by spatial frequency and orientation.
Typically, sixteen output channels are used for each output signal, comprising four
spatial orientations (vertical, horizontal, and the two diagonals) and four spatial
frequencies. The resulting channels are analysed by a masking calculator 15. This
-- 15 -- calculator modifies each channel in accordance with the masking effect of the other
channels; for example the perceptual importance of a low spatial-frequency
phenomenon is reduced if a higher frequency spatial phenomenon is also present.
Masking also occurs in the temporal sense – certain features are less noticeable to
the human observer if other effects occur within a short time of them.

20 Calibration of this model of masking requires data describing how
spatial/temporal frequency of a given orientation decreases the visibility of another
stimulus. This information cannot be obtained as a complete description as the
number of combinations is very large. Therefore, the separate influence of each
parameter is measured. First the masking effect of a background on a stimulus is
25 measured according to the relative orientation between the two. Then the effect of
spatial and temporal frequency difference between masker and stimulus is measured.
Finally, the two characteristics are combined by interpolating between common
measured points.

In a simple comparison between original and degraded frames, certain types
30 of error, such as a horizontal/vertical shift, result in large amounts of error all over the
frame, but would not be noticeable to a user. This problem can be addressed by
employing frame realignment, as specified in the ITU-T *"Draft new recommendation
on multimedia communication delay, synchronisation, and frame rate measurement"*,

COM 12-29-E, December 1997. However this simple method does not fully account for the subjectivity of the error, since it does not allow for other common defects such as degradation of elements in the compressed sequence.

Following the sensory layer, the image is decomposed to allow calculation of error subjectivity by the perceptual layer (Figure 3), according to the importance of errors in relation to structures within the image. If the visible error coincides with a critical feature of the image, such as an edge, then it is more subjectively disturbing. The basic image elements, which allow a human observer to perceive the image content, can be thought of as a set of abstracted boundaries. These boundaries can be formed by colour and luminance differences, texture changes and movement as well as edges, and are identified in the decomposed image. Even some "Gestalt" effects, which cause a boundary to be perceived where none actually exists, can be algorithmically measured to allow appropriate weighting.

These boundaries are required in order to perceive image content and this is why visible errors that degrade these boundaries, for example by blurring or changing their shape, have greater subjective significance than those which do not. The output from the perceptual layer is a set of context-sensitive error descriptors that can be weighted differently to map to a variety of opinion criteria.

In some instances, a boundary may be completely absent, or a spurious boundary may be present, for example when a "ghost" image is formed by multipath reflection. In this case, the presence or absence of the boundary itself is the error.

Figure 3 is a representation of the perceptual layer, which measures the subjective significance of any errors present in the image sequence. The original signal 16 and the degraded signal 16d, each filtered and masked as described with reference to Figure 1, are first each analysed (either in parallel or sequentially) in a component extraction process 31 to identify characteristics of the edges or boundaries of the principal components of each image. These characteristics are supplied as inputs 32, 32d to a comparison process 33 which generates an output 38 indicative of the overall perceptual degradation of the degraded image with respect to the original image.

The components identified by the extraction process 31 may be distinguished by:

- Colour/Luminance
- Strong Edges
- 5 • Closure Effects
- Texture
- Movement
- Binocular (Stereoscopic) Disparities

The first four of these are illustrated in Figures 4 to 7 respectively. The
 10 others rely on phenomena relating to movement and stereoscopy, not readily illustrated on the printed page. For similar reasons, only luminance differences, and not colour differences, are illustrated.

Figures 4 to 7 all illustrate a circle and a square, the square obscuring part of the circle. In each case, the boundary between the two elements is readily perceived,
 15 although the two elements are represented in different ways. In Figure 4, the circle and square have different luminance – the circle is black and the square is white. A boundary is perceived at the locations where this property changes. It will be noted that in Figures 5, 6 and 7 there are also locations where the luminance changes, (for example the boundaries between each individual stripe in Figure 7) but these are not
 20 perceived as the principal boundaries of the image.

Boundaries defined by edges are illustrated in Figure 5. A “strong edge”, or outline, is a narrow linear feature, of a colour or luminance contrasting with the regions on either side of it. The viewer perceives this linear feature not primarily as a component in its own right, but as a boundary separating the components either side
 25 of it. In analysis of the image, such an edge can be identified by a localised high-frequency element in the filtered signal. Suitable processes identifying edges have been developed, for example the edge extraction process described by S M Smith and J M Brady in “*SUSAN – A new approach to low-level image processing*” (Technical Report TR95SMS1c, Oxford Centre for Functional magnetic Resonance Imaging of
 30 the Brain, 1995 <http://www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/~steve/susan/susan.ps.gz>).

In many circumstances a viewer can perceive an edge where no continuous line is present. An example is shown in Figure 6, where the lines are discontinuous. The human perceptual system carries out a process known as “closure”, which tends

to complete such partial edges. (A further example is illustrated by the fact that none of Figures 4 to 7 in fact depict a full circle. The viewer infers the presence of a circle from the four lenticular regions actually depicted in each Figure). Various processes have been developed to emulate the closure process carried out by the human
5 perceptual system. One such process is described by Kass M., Witkin A., and Terzopoulos D., "*Snakes: Active Boundary Models*", published in the *Proceedings of First International Conference on Computer Vision 1987*, pages 259-269.

"Texture" can be identified in many regions in which the properties already mentioned are not constant. For example, in a region occupied by parallel lines, of a
10 colour or luminance contrasting with the background, the individual location of each line is not of great perceptual significance. However, if the lines have different orientations in different parts of the region, an observer will perceive a boundary where the orientation changes. This property is found for instance in the orientation of brushstrokes in paintings. An example is shown in Figure 7, in which the circle and
15 square are defined by two orthogonal series of parallel bars. Note that if the image is enlarged such that the angular separation of the stripes is closer to the peak value shown in Figure 2, and the dimensions of the square and circle further from that peak value, the individual stripes would become the dominant features, instead of the square and circle. It will be apparent that were the orientation of the bars to change,
20 the boundary between the square and the circle may become less distinct. To identify the texture content of a region of the image, the energy content in each channel output from the Gabor filters 13 is used. Each channel represents a given spatial frequency and orientation. By identifying regions where a given channel or channels have high energy content, regions of similar texture can be identified.

25 Shapes can be discerned by the human perceptual system in other ways, not illustrated in the accompanying drawings. In particular, disparities between related images, such as the pairs of image frames used in stereoscopy, or successive image frames in a motion picture, may identify image elements not apparent on inspection of a single frame. For example, if two otherwise similar images, with no discernible
30 structure in either individual image, include a region displaced in one image in relation to its position in the other, the boundaries of that region can be discerned if the two images are viewed simultaneously, one by each eye. Similarly, in a moving image, a region of apparently random pixels moving coherently across another such region will

be discernible to an observer, even though no shape would be discernible in an individual frame taken from the sequence. This phenomenon is observable in the natural world – there are many creatures such as flatfish which have colouring similar to their environment, and which are only noticeable when they move.

5 The component extraction process identifies the boundaries of the principal elements of both the original and degraded signals. The perceptual importance of each boundary depends on a number of factors, such as its nature (edge, colour change, texture, etc), the degree of contrast involved, and its context. In this latter category, a high frequency component to the filtered and masked signal will signify
10 that there are a large number of individual edges present in that region of the image. This will reduce the significance of each individual edge – compare Figure 5, which has few such edges, with Figure 7, which has many more such edges.

Each individual extraction process carried out in the component splitting step 31, on its own, typically performs relatively poorly, as they all tend to create false
15 boundaries, and fail to detect others. However, the combination of different processes increases the quality of the result, a visual object being often defined by many perceptual boundaries, as discussed by Scassellati B.M in *"High-level perceptual contours from a variety of low-level physical features"* (Master Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, May 1995) (<http://www.ai.mit.edu/people/scasz/thesis.ps.gz>). For this reason the comparison process 33 compares all the
20 boundaries together, regardless of how they are defined except insofar as this affects their perceptual significance, to produce a single aggregated output 38.

The results 32, 32d of the component analysis 31 are passed to a comparison process 33, in which the component boundaries identified in each signal
25 are compared. By comparing the perceptual relevance of all boundary types in the image, a measure of the overall perceptual significance of degradation of a signal can be determined, and provided as an output 38. The perceptual significance of errors in a degraded signal depends on the context in which they occur. For example, the loss or gain of a diagonal line (edge) in Figure 7 would have little effect on the viewer's
30 perception of the image, but the same error, if applied to Figure 5, would have a much greater significance. Similarly, random dark specks would have a much greater effect on the legibility of Figure 6 than they would on Figure 4.

In more detail, the comparison process 33 consists of a number of individual elements. The first element identifies the closest match between the arrangements of the boundaries in the two images (34), and uses this to effect a bulk translation of one image with respect to the other (35) so that these boundaries correspond.

5 The next process 36 identifies features to which the human cognitive system is most sensitive, and weighting factors W are generated for such features. For example, it is possible to weight the cognitive relevance of perceptually critical image elements such as those responsible for visual speech cues, for example it is known that certain facial features are principally responsible for visual speech cues. See for
10 example Rosenblum, L.D., & Saldaña, H.M. (1996). *"An audiovisual test of kinematic primitives for visual speech perception"*. (Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, vol 22, pages 318-331) and Jordan, T.R. & Thomas, S.M. (1998). *"Anatomically guided construction of point-light facial images"*. (Technical report. Human Perception and Communication Research Group, University of Nottingham,
15 Nottingham, U.K).

We can infer that a face is present using pattern recognition or by virtue of the nature of the service.

The perceptual significance of each boundary in one image is then compared with the corresponding boundary (if any) in the other (37), and an output 38
20 generated according to the degree of difference in such perceptual significance and the weightings W previously determined. It should be noted that differences in how the boundary is defined (hard edge, colour difference, etc) do not necessarily affect the perceptual significance of the boundary, so all the boundaries, however defined, are compared together. Moreover, since the presence of a spurious boundary can be
25 as perceptually significant as the absence of a real one, it is the absolute difference in perceptibility that is determined.

Note that degradation of the signal may have caused a boundary defined by, for example, an edge, to disappear, but the boundary may still be discernible because of some other difference such as colour, luminance or texture. The error image
30 produced by established models (filtered and masked noise) provides an indication of the visible degradation of the image. The comparison process 37 includes a measure of the extent to which the essential content is maintained and offers an improved measure of the image intelligibility. In comparing the boundaries (step 37), the

perceptual significance of a given boundary may depend on its nature. A boundary between different textures may be less well defined than one defined by an edge, and such reduced boundary perceptibility is taken into account in generating the output.

This process is suitable for great range of video quality assessment
5 applications, where identification and comparison of the perceptual boundaries is
necessary. A good example is given by very low bandwidth systems where a face is
algorithmically reconstructed. This would be impossible for many of the previously
known visual models to assess appropriately. The comparison of perceptual
boundaries also enables the assessment of synthetic representations of images such
10 as an animated talking face, in which the features of the image that facilitate
subsequent cognitive interpretation as a face are of prime importance.

CLAIMS

1. A method of measuring the differences between a first video signal (16) and a second video signal (16d), comprising the steps of:
 - 5 analysing (31) the information content of each video signal to identify the perceptually relevant boundaries of the video images depicted therein; and
 - comparing (33) the boundaries so defined in the first signal with those in the second signal; the comparison including determination of the extent to which the properties of the boundaries defined in the original image are preserved,
 - 10 generating an output (38) indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals.
2. A method according to Claim 1, in which the information content is analysed for a plurality of boundary-identifying characteristics (32, 32d), and the properties of
15 the boundaries on which the comparison (37) is based include the characteristics by which such boundaries are defined in each of the signals.
- 3 A method according to claim 2, wherein the characteristics include the presence of edges.
20
- 4 A method according to claim 2 or 3, wherein the characteristics include the presence of disparities between frames
- 5 A method according to claim 2, 3 or 4, wherein the characteristics include
25 changes in at least one of the properties of: luminance, colour or texture.
- 6 A method according to any of claims 1 to 5, in which the comparison includes a comparison (36) of the perceptibility of corresponding boundaries identified in the first and second signals.
30

7 A method according to any preceding claim, in which the comparison of the images includes the steps of

identification (34) of the principal elements in each image, and

5 compensation (35) for differences in the relative positions of the said principal elements.

8 A method according to any preceding claim, in which the analysis includes identification of perceptually significant image features, and the output (38) indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals is weighted
10 according to the perceptual significance of such image features.

9. A method according to claim 8, in which the perceptually significant image features are those characteristic of the human face.

~~15 10. A method according to claim 9, in which a weighting is applied to the output~~
according to the significance of the feature in providing visual cues to speech.

11 A method according to claim 8, in which the perceptually significant image features are those by which individual text characters are distinguished.

20

12 Apparatus for measuring the differences between a first video signal (16) and a second video signal (16d), comprising:

analysis means (31) for the information content of each video signal to identify the perceptually relevant boundaries of the video images depicted therein;

25 and

comparison means (33) for comparing the boundaries so defined in the first signal (16) with those in the second signal (16d); the comparison including determination of the extent to which the properties of the boundaries defined in the original image are preserved,

30 and for generating an output (38) indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals (16, 16d).

13. Apparatus according to Claim 12, wherein the analysis means (31) is arranged to analyse the information content in the signals (16, 16d) for a plurality of boundary-identifying characteristics (32, 32d), and the comparison means (33) is arranged to compare the characteristics by which such boundaries are defined in each
5 of the signals.

14 Apparatus according to claim 13, wherein the analysis means (31) includes means to identify the presence of edges.

10 15. Apparatus according to claim 13 or 14, wherein the analysis means (33) includes means to identify the presence of disparities between frames

16. Apparatus according to claim 13, 14 or 15, wherein the analysis means (33) includes means to identify differences in at least one of the properties of: luminance,
15 colour or texture.

17 Apparatus according to any of claims 12 to 16, in which the comparison means (33) includes means (36) for determining the perceptibility of the boundaries identified in the first and second signals.

20

18 Apparatus according to any of claims 12 to 17, in which the comparison means (33) includes image matching means (34) for identification of the principal elements in each image and translation means (35) for effecting translation of one image (16d) to compensate for differences in the relative positions of such elements
25 in the first and second images.

19. Apparatus according to any of claims 12 to 18, in which the comparison means (33) includes weighting means 36 for identifying perceptually significant image features in the components (32, 32d), and weighting the output (38) according to the
30 perceptual significance of such image features.



20. Apparatus according to any of claims 12 to 19, further comprising visual layer means (11,12,13,14,15) for processing original input signals (11) to emulate the response of the human visual system, to generate modified input signals (16, 16d) for input to the analysis means (31)

ABSTRACT
ANALYSIS OF VIDEO SIGNAL QUALITY


Two video signals, typically an original signal (16) and a degraded version (16d) of
5 the same signal, are analysed firstly to identify the perceptually relevant boundaries
of the elements forming the video images depicted therein (31). These boundaries are
then compared (33) to determine the extent to which the properties of the boundaries
defined in one image (16) are preserved in the other (16d), to generate an output (38)
indicative of the perceptual difference between the first and second signals. The
10 boundaries may be defined by edges, colour, luminance or texture contrasts,
disparities between frames in a moving or stereoscopic image, or other means. The
presence, absence, difference in clarity or difference in means of definition of the
boundaries is indicative of the perceptual importance of the differences between the
signals, and therefore of the extent to which any degradation of the signal (16d) will
15 be perceived by the human viewer of the resulting degraded image. The results may
also be weighted (36) according to the perceptual importance of the image depicted -
for example the features which identify a human face, and in particular those
responsible for visual speech cues.

20 Figure 3

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)



THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)



THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)




Fig 5




Fig 7




Fig 4




Fig 6

PCT/GBOO/00171
BT GROUP Legal
24-1-00

services

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)